20c MARCH 19, 1951

New Republic

"New Statesman": Liberal Spokesman?

A debate by Kingsley Martin,

Richard L. Strout and the Editors

HAROLD L. ICKES ON:

PEARSON'S PUBLIC SERVICE

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Pointedly Biased!

A SINGLE LETTER, printed in a Los Angeles newspaper, led to the transfer of the *New Republic* (and later "The Nation") from the open shelves to the custody of the librarian in sixteen high schools of that city. The letter charged the *New Republic* is a "source of much satisfaction to Communists."

The effect of this "single letter" making an untruthful accusation highlights the extreme danger now threatening freedom of expression. According to Hannah Bloom, writing in FRONTIER, a monthly liberal magazine published on the Coast, "leaders of the local teachers' union (AFL) and the American Civil Liberties Union were led a merry chase" when they directed inquiries on the suppression to school officials. Associate Superintendent Blair described the matter as "routine procedure" but added that magazines that are "pointedly biased" should be used "with caution."

The prompt and courageous action of the ACLU and the teachers' union was successful. The magazines have now been restored to the open shelves. The vigorous protest of our friends emphasizes the fact that liberals do still valiantly defend their principles.

Miss Bloom, after noting that it is "doubtful a Communist would be caught dead reading such conservative literature as the *New Repubic,*" declares that the "elimination of the suspect magazines . . . would leave the schools without one periodical expressing the liberal viewpoint."

"Pointedly biased"—the phrase of Superintendent Blair—cannot be used to describe the *New Republic.* But it does aptly apply to many magazines enjoying high repute and popularity in the Los Angeles school system. Unlike most of its journalistic contemporaries, the *New Republic* has an open, inquiring mind, which seeks, without prejudice or preconception, to find the answers to the cruelly perplexing problems of our age.

If you are a subscriber, RENEW; if not, subscribe NOW.

Armed Service Order Form

THE NEW REPUBLIC
40 East 49 Street • New York 17, N. Y.

For the enclosed $4.00 please enter an annual subscription in my name at the special Armed Service rate of $4.00. (Open to active members of the Services at APO or military addresses).

NAME_____

ADDRESS_____

IN FULL_____

3-19-51

Regular Order Form

THE NEW REPUBLIC
40 East 49 Street • New York 17, N. Y.

For the enclosed $6.50 please enter an annual subscription in my name. (Foreign or Canadian postage $1.00 extra.)

NAME_____

STREET_____

CITY_____

ZONE_____ STATE_____ 3-19-51

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Republic

CONTENTS FOR MAR. 19, 1951

5 British and American Liberals, An Editorial
7 The Week:
7 The Deputies Meet
7 Bevin to Morrison
8 Senate OKs UMS
8 Business Bedfellows
9 Wasted Farm Power
9 California's "Great Debate"
10 Outside America
11 The Lead-Pipe of Labor "Peace," by Guy Nunn
13 Terror in Textiles, by Jean Begeman
15 A Communication from Kingsley Martin
16 Mr. Strout's Reply
18 Harold L. Ickes
19 Books:
19 "The Age of Longing," reviewed by Percy Winner
20 "A Plan for Peace," reviewed by Alexander H. Uhl
21 "Psychoanalysis and Religion," reviewed by Meyer H. Maskin
21 "Water, Land, and People," reviewed by Russell Lord
22 On the Air
23 Theatre

EDITOR: Michael Straight
EDITORIAL DIRECTOR: Bruce Bliven
PUBLISHER: Daniel Mebane
ASSOCIATE EDITOR: Helen Fuller
ASSISTANT EDITOR: Elizabeth Huling
REPORTER: Jean Begeman
CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Malcolm Cowley, John Farrelly, Harold L. Ickes, Joseph P. Lash, Max Lerner, James R. Newman, Gus Tyler
DEPARTMENTS: Robert Hatch (Chief), Cecil Smith (Music), Saul Carson (Radio and Television), Harold Clurman (Theatre), Lincoln Kirstein (Fine Arts)
COPY ASSISTANTS: Marjorie Stanley, Lucille Davis

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1951, IN THE U. S. A. BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., PUBLISHING OFFICE 301 N ST., N. E., WASHINGTON 2, D. C. EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS COMMUNICATIONS SHOULD BE ADDRESSED TO 40 EAST 49 ST., NEW YORK 17, N. Y. ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER SEPTEMBER 26, 1950, AT THE POST OFFICE AT WASHINGTON, D. C., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879. SINGLE COPY, 20c; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, $6.50; CANADA AND FOREIGN, $7.50. PRINTED IN THE U. S. A.

WASHINGTON WIRE

WATCHING the gulls dip their wings to Florida waters, Truman may well be deciding whether to run in 1952. When he returns he is bound to say, even to himself, that he will await events, but subconsciously he may have decided. Bess and Margaret don't want him to run. He will be 68 in May, 1952, and the only President nominated at that age (Harrison lived just one month in office). There is only one living ex-President, and good old Hoover might not have made it either if we all had not been lucky enough to defeat him in '32.

There are other points. The new two-term amendment specifically excepts Truman, but it hands the GOP the argument that it would not be "ethical" for him to run when men who follow will be forbidden. He can retire with a good score on foreign affairs even if things aren't going so well at the moment at home. Then there is an alternative to running for President: a delightful one. Why not run instead against Missouri GOP isolationist Kem for the Senate, to almost certain victory, and be back in the Upper Chamber, an honored Elder Statesman? It has been done before. Andrew Johnson returned to the Senate after serving a Presidential term, and nowhere in the Constitution does it say that a sitting President cannot run for another office. Truman could take his Senate seat in January, 1953.

If Truman withdrew, we doubt that he would have the power to pick the Democratic nominee. The race would be wide open. Could Truman make Chief Justice Vinson Democratic heir-apparent? He is said to favor Vinson. But although a retiring President has influence, we are inclined to think that the restive and insubordinate Party convention would take matters into its own hands. A tentative United Press poll of Democratic state leaders puts Sen. Paul Douglas (Ill.) first in preference if Truman withdraws. One thing is certain. The Democratic Party had better hang on to its labor wing, now restive and angry, or it will take an awful licking next year. Douglas—a member of Americans for Democratic Action—is probably enough of a liberal to do this.

While we are about it, we might as well dispose of General Eisenhower's role. Ike gives increasing evidence of being a candidate and has had scouts in Washington. He is certainly a latent candidate: that is, he would intervene if he thought Taft or a similar crypto-isolationist were likely to grab the GOP nomination. Ike's strategy now is to threaten the GOP with a switch to the Democratic side if they put up a man like Taft. It is part of the absurdity of US politics that Ike might be nominated by either party. The issue offered Americans is usually personalities, not principles. It is true that New Deal reform and social legislation are generally associated with the Democrats, and bank presidents vote Republican. The difference isn't enough, however, to bar Ike from either side, though his trend is conservative. We have watched and liked Ike for years, and if the dominant issue were to be foreign affairs, we think he would make a good executive. With respect to economic and social reforms, on which we have always thought Ike a bit naive, we would pick Paul Douglas any day.

The Federal Trade Commission has issued a 500-page report saying Section 8 of the Anti-Trust law is a dead letter. The press has ignored it. This section says a man can't be a director simultaneously on two competing companies. Congress passed the law in 1914 to keep competition alive to the advantage of consumers. The idea was the Biblical theory that a man can't serve two masters. But the massive new report which

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

traces out the story of interlocking directorates in America's web of financial power shows that the law is so full of loopholes as to have no meaning.

The question of federal control of off-shore oil lands is not settled, even in the face of three recent Supreme Court decisions handing the fabulously rich properties over from the states to the federal government. Thirty-five Senators have introduced a bill to reverse the law upon which the Court based its decisions in order to provide for state exploitation of oil lands reaching from the low-tide marks to three miles at sea. Legally, it appears possible that Congress could hand this wealth over from the nation to the states but, fortunately, such a law would almost certainly meet a Presidential veto. It is rather doubtful if this veto could be overridden.

Notes: The RFC mess is not a major scandal, but it is a dirty business; the insensitivity of Truman to the influence-peddlers round him is the disheartening feature. . . . When and if socialism comes to America it may be as the receiver rather than the conqueror of capitalism; thus New York State may soon be running the Long Island Railroad by default just as Boston took over its own bankrupt transit system. . . . There's increasing evidence that the shortage fear is being carried too far; retailers' warehouses are bulging with many items that may have to be dumped before long at sacrific prices. . . . The 1936 CIO-AFL breach has been nearly closed by the common front against Charlie Wilson; Democratic leaders who can't see what labor's defection means had better study last week's Missouri by-election. . . . A Republican gained a "safe" Democratic seat while labor sat on its hands. . . . Administration leaders fear that they lack the votes to put the grain-for-India bill through the House; delay in the Rules Committee is only part of the trouble. . . . Jim Farley who says everybody knew that FDR was "a dying man" in the 1944 election didn't trail him as we did; Roosevelt had more energy than most reporters.

Washington T. R. B.

CORRESPONDENCE

Peking in the UN

SIR: A statement made recently by one of our Government officials seems to be the current trend in thought of not only the representatives of the American people but the American people themselves. Although this official agreed that under ordinary conditions the Chinese Communists had a perfect right to a seat in the United Nations, he considered any such support in seating them at this time a reward for aggression and hence inadvisable.

Now, I am wholly against any form of appeasement, and I am also just as firmly opposed to the existing situation where any move on our part toward peaceful settlement of our disagreements with the Communists is invariably termed "appeasement," after which, being tainted with afore-named word, all suggestions and proposals immediately become signs of weakness on our part and are therefore cast out as avoidable evils.

Now, I believe that right makes right regardless of the exterior circumstances involved—and that if it was really right to admit the Chinese Communists into the confidence of the UN before their aggression in Korea, then it is right by everything in God's One World that yet remains just and good.

We here in Syracuse are building a War Memorial, but I don't think we're going to get it built fast enough. All our memories will soon be consumed in present disaster unless we realize that neither the US nor the Chinese Communist has a complete monopoly on righteousness.

What we need now is less understanding between the nations and more understanding within the world.

What's it going to be—One World or None?

BURTON DAVISON

Syracuse, N. Y.

The Britannica

SIR: Paul Nemenyi is right (*NR*, February 19). The *Britannica* has long been a public utility in the domain of scholarship and should be subject to regulation by the public opinion of scholars. Many of the articles of the various editions have been classics and they ought to be signed, not by a cryptogram with a key in the front, as if the authorship were reluctantly admitted, but honestly and blatantly, as if the *Britannica* knew that scholarship is a human product and were not ashamed of being mortal. And nowadays the articles ought to be dated. In the old days, when the date of the latest edition was clear to the user, it was not necessary, but at present the *Britannica* buys new stuff from a creative mind, puts it on the shelf to dry out for two, four, six years, gives the author a chance to revive his withered words without growing a new plant, and finally prints the preserved object as of the wrong date. Enough of this and the glory will depart from the *Britannica.*

DR. EDWIN G. BORING

Cambridge, Mass.

Cowley Is Tops

SIR: That was a charming review of Edmund Wilson's *Classics and Commercials* which Arthur Mizener wrote for you. I would yield little to him in his admiration of Wilson, whose verve and readability are seldom paralleled by other American critics, but on the security of his judgments and humanity I would give the edge to your own Malcolm Cowley.

CHARLES ALLDREDGE

Washington, D. C.

A Broad Agenda

SIR: The *NR* writes (Feb. 19, page 6) "a broad agenda." One hears it on the radio constantly. Don't you think we ought to draw the line somewhere? What would become of grammar if nobody ever paid attention to it?

Monrovia, Calif. UPTON SINCLAIR

[Technically, Mr. Sinclair is right and we ought to say "agendum." However, sympathetic as we are with this attitude with regard to "data," we feel that *"agendum"* is a lost cause. - THE EDITORS]

Tom Paine and Thetford

SIR: The town of Thetford, Norfolk, England, gave America one of her greatest citizens, Thomas Paine. . . .

In connection with the Festival of Britain, the Borough of Thetford will be celebrating Thomas Paine's connection with this ancient town, in the first week of June, with the performance of a play about him, the recitation of some of his work by famous American and British film stars, and the formation of a permanent Thomas Paine Museum and Library.

I would be most grateful for the loan of any relics, letters or portraits of Thomas Paine, for the month of June, and the gift of any books or prints which admirers of Paine could send us. We would insure and take every care of any objects of value that our American friends would loan us. . . .

(MRS.) E. WATLING

Thetford, England Mayor

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOLUME 124, NUMBER 12, ISSUE 1894, WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 19, 1951

New Republic

BRITISH AND AMERICAN LIBERALS

KINGSLEY MARTIN, in his reply to Richard Strout's comments on the *New Statesman and Nation* begins by stating that: "The fact that the *New Republic* should publish Richard Strout's article shows in itself how seriously things have gone wrong between American and British liberals."

We disagree. We make no claim to speak for American liberals. We doubt if Mr. Martin should claim to speak for British liberals. We think that the peoples of Britain and America are liberal in spirit. We think they are as closely bound together as they have ever been in time of peace. As for the *New Statesman* and the *New Republic*, the contrast in their editorial policies has been apparent for a long time. Why should it be concealed? Mr. Martin repeatedly justifies his criticism of American policy by saying that outspoken honesty is the basis of a sound relationship. That is right.

The *New Republic* believes that the world is divided by a basic struggle. We believe that that struggle is between dictatorship of the Soviet brand and democracy. We stand on the side of democracy.

We believe that democracy has many weaknesses. We know that it has made many mistakes We recognize that sometimes those mistakes endanger human welfare. There our doubts about democracy end. Democratic peoples do not suppress the liberties of other peoples. Democratic peoples do not wage aggressive war. Democracy is not inherently evil. It rights its own mistakes. It offers the great potential for human happiness.

We believe that the Soviet dictatorship in contrast is inherently evil. We believe that it is self-perpetuating and incapable of progress toward a just society. We believe it is the implacable enemy of democratic socialism and all forms of democracy, committed to oppressing its own subjects, and to enslaving the world.

We believe that Stalinism is at war with democracy, and that it makes no moral distinction between war by military and non-military means. It recognizes military warfare as a legitimate means of conquest. It has demonstrated its capacity to direct aggressive war. That does not mean that it chooses war alone. It seeks to expand along lines of least resistance. Where the non-Communist nations are politically corrupted or economically prostrated Stalinism seeks to expand by revolution. Where they are unarmed, it expands by military force. Our task, of course, is to build political and economic strength. It is also to build military strength so that a world war for Stalin will be a losing war.

To argue that guns are not enough is to labor the obvious among liberals. To argue that guns are unnecessary is to invite attack. If we intend to win this conflict without world war, as we must, then we will have to make military warfare unprofitable for Stalin. That means the rearmament and the unification of the democratic nations.

We believe in the unification of the West. We believe in federation for Western Europe, and in Atlantic Union for Europe, North America and the British Commonwealth. We believe that partnership, open and equal, solid and lasting, of Britain and the US is the basis of all these plans. It is our "Rock of Salvation" and our great hope for peace.

We believe that partnership is built on common purpose. We doubt that the continuous development of a common purpose can safely be left to casual meetings between the heads of separate and sovereign states. We believe in the progressive union of the peoples of Britain and America. We want to see all artificial barriers of trade and currency and citizenship stripped away between our two peoples. We believe that this is the time to join together nations that were torn apart almost two centuries ago.

The road to union is trying. Both countries have their isolationists, their nationalists, their vested interests who thrive on separation. We believe that the task of men of good will in Britain and the US is to carry union forward by constructive criticism, sound advice and practicable proposals. All this is for the purpose of freeing the United Nations so that it may function as the universal organization in which Communist and non-Communist nations resolve their conflicts short of war.

That is the editorial objective we have set for the *New Republic*. If it is also the objective of the *New Statesman*, then the pages of the *New Statesman* do not make it clear.

The *New Statesman*, Mr. Martin states, is "a socialist paper." He does not add, as we would add, that socialism

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the Fair Deal are both valid expressions of democracy working toward the same ends. He says instead that the conflict is between socialism and capitalism and that because "the center of capitalist power has moved from London to Washington . . . socialists' criticism must also move from London to Washington." That apparently is the real issue to the *New Statesman* today.

As for Russia, Russia to Mr. Martin is a Communist state, and Communism "is a world social movement which has already won its way mainly without aid from the Red Army over an area extending from the Oder to Vladivostok and Peking." (The fact is, of course, that every satellite nation holds power through the Red Army alone and further that the Chinese Communists took power by armed force.) Stalinism apparently is not inherently evil or aggressive to Mr. Martin. He concedes simply that "Soviet intransigence is largely responsible for what seems to us the present hysterical state of mind of many Americans."

As for halting Soviet aggression by a united Western effort to make war unprofitable, that is collective security, and collective security to Mr. Martin "seems an excuse for starting world war with the ludicrous idea of quenching Communism by bombs." The March 3 *New Statesman* argues that the issue for Britain is "collective security" or "national independence." Its conclusion seems to be that if Britain will repudiate the entire structure of the North Atlantic alliance, she may then enjoy "national independence."

This is apparently the *New Statesman* line. Its editors argue that if the North Atlantic alliance were disbanded, the American Air Force and Army ejected from Britain and Europe and the political ties of America and Britain broken, Britain could then act as "peacemaker and conciliator in world politics," neutral and "independent of both the American and Communist blocs."

To hold this view, one must believe that American democracy and Soviet dictatorship are equal threats to world peace. And that is the conclusion of G. D. H. Cole, a senior editor of the *New Statesman* and its clearest editorial voice. Cole writes:

> I believe the Soviet Union to have been quite largely responsible for the disastrous worsening of the world situation which followed the introduction of the Marshall Plan; I put the main blame for its subsequent worsening on the United States. . . .

Many Americans may even agree with this extreme statement. They will explain that it is necessary to exaggerate and to be extreme in order to be effective today. They will conclude that the enemy is Luce and MacArthur who are ready to resolve today's conflict by war and that the *New Statesman,* in repudiating the America of Luce and MacArthur, is serving world peace.

But whether or not General MacArthur wants war—he is neither President nor Secretary of State and is not likely to be—civil power is still supreme in this country. The American people have never lost faith in world peace and today are searching for a basis of world peace.

If the *New Statesman* accepted the basic concept that the hope for peace lies in democratic strength achieved through democratic unity then its criticisms of extremist elements in our two nations would be valid and constructive. But clearly its criticisms are part of a general rejection of this concept. Cole states:

> I want not to side with the Soviet Union or the Western Communists against the Americans but to make a stand for peace and democratic socialism against them both.

In conversation, Mr. Cole continues that if it comes to a choice between the Soviet world and the American world, he will have no hesitation in choosing the Soviet world.

Given this general conclusion, specific criticisms of steps toward collective security are not efforts to advance collective security along sounder lines, but attempts to delay and frustrate the growing unity of the West.

Is this the editorial policy of the *New Statesman?* Presumably it is, since it notes its disagreement with Mr. Cole only on minor points of emphasis.

We look on Cole's refusal to recognize a moral issue between Soviet dictatorship and Western democracy as moral bankruptcy. We suppose that Cole's moral bankruptcy represents in part the triumph of doctrine over fact in a man who has spent his life condemning capitalism as the enemy and who cannot change without seeming to repudiate himself. It represents also a deep-seated antipathy to American life and culture. In a letter to the *New Statesman* Lord Brand writes of Cole that, "Behind almost every sentence of his article seems to lie an irrational hatred of Americans and all their works." Those who know Cole will conclude that this is not an unfair statement. Again, is it the policy of the *New Statesman?* Mr. Martin is frank in his cultural antipathy for the US and expresses it on every occasion from depicting US soldiers in Korea as wilful murderers to defending the booing of American tennis players at Wimbledon. Our concern is not that he is anti-American, which it is his privilege to be, but that today anti-Americanism does not serve peace.

Certainly the *New Statesman* also defends America on occasion. But its predominant weight is thrown against efforts to strengthen and unify the West. Together with the neutralists in continental Europe it represents a predominantly negative force exposing extremist trends in the West but serving no constructive end and weakening the will to survive free.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We know that many American liberals and *NR* readers will disagree with us. We know also that many British liberals strongly disagree with the *New Statesman,* for its own correspondence columns argue our case far more eloquently than we have done. The argument itself serves to help all of us realize that the close cooperation of our two governments is not enough to bring about the unity of our two peoples. It is on the necessity for unity that we have no doubt.

That is also the position of Arnold Toynbee. And when Kingsley Martin quotes Toynbee's phrase, "no annihilation without representation," to justify his own neutralist position, he is standing Mr. Toynbee on his head. For Toynbee's point is that Atlantic Union is the means by which the British people can regain their lost sovereignty by pooling it in a common sovereignty with the United States in which full representation is given to both peoples in common representative councils. We hope that Mr. Toynbee does represent "the present mood of Britain," as Kingsley Martin asserts.

For the truth is that the present partnership of Britain and America is still concealed and illicit. As long as we refuse to affirm that we share a common destiny the stronger member of the partnership is bound to exert its power and make unilateral decisions, while the weaker is dragged protesting in its wake. Kingsley Martin may respond to this situation by leading the protests. The wise course as Arnold Toynbee knows is to create the common institutions through which the partnership may be made explicit, equal and lasting.

THE WEEK

THE DEPUTIES MEET

In the first week at the Palais Rose, the Soviet delegate, Andrei Gromyko, strove hard to concentrate discussion on the issue of rearmament of Western Germany and to set the framework of discussion within the terms of the Potsdam Agreement. In one sense he was right, since the Council of Foreign Ministers was created to implement Potsdam. But, in fact, the Potsdam Agreement is without relevance in today's world.

Gromyko at first left German unification off his proposed agenda. Western delegates pointed out that the peace treaty he suggested was impossible as long as Germany was divided. He added unification. At each point his agenda was written to imply Western responsibility for the breakdown of world unity. The Western delegates disagreed. They held fast to the argument that the danger to peace was the presence of the Red Army in Europe in overwhelming strength, and they offered again to discuss Germany within the framework of a general limitation of armaments. They stressed the need and the practicability of a peace treaty for Austria. Its chances were lessened when Gromyko tied an Austrian treaty to a settlement in Trieste, an irrelevant issue raised by Russia in 1948 as part of a filibuster against a settlement in Austria.

As the deputies met in the Palais Rose, the Western governments came to a new accord with the Bonn Government, moving toward a contractual relationship, which for Bonn would be the next best thing to a peace treaty, impossible as long as Germany's frontiers remain undefined.

At the same time Social Democrats and Christian Democrats at Bonn joined in taking the initiative in proposing the unification of Germany under free elections.

For the Russians, these two developments leave no early solution. They cannot relinquish the leadership of the German unity movement to Bonn. Nor can they give up the resources they monopolize in Eastern Germany. A bold offer on disarmament that they cannot easily ignore has been made by a united West. Yet disarmament would probably mean the evacuation by the Red Army of Eastern Europe, which the Stalinist regimes of Eastern Europe might not survive. Soviet leaders, if they are wise, know that the US is not committed to war. They know that the heart of Western rearmament is the US and that our capacity to fight will be enormously strengthened unless a realistic alternative to rearmament is outlined very soon.

The West has made an offer and has little more to give. The Russians face again the kind of choice they faced in Paris when the Marshall Plan was first discussed. They can undertake to stabilize an uneasy but tolerable status quo in the hope of greater gains later on, or they can strike out for immediate political gains. They can look on America as the determinant of their future and offer a realistic alternative to American rearmament. Or, forsaking all hopes of checking our rearmament, they can disregard America and concentrate on dramatic new strokes to force wedges between America and her allies. Either way, ultimate Soviet intentions may remain the same. The interest of the West, however, lies in maximum unity now in order to press Russia to the first of these choices in the hope, as Justice Holmes once said, that "Time wears away many fighting faiths."

BEVIN TO MORRISON

A trade-union boss presiding over the Foreign Office was a new experience for Britain. But the adjustments Britain had to make in the world meant lower living standards for her workers, and since their spirit was all important, Ernest Bevin was a sound choice. All of us felt his weaknesses. His greatness

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

we rarely conceded. Bevin seized a few phrases spoken at Harvard and shaped them into a program for Europe's regeneration. In dealing with Russia, Bevin's lifetime in the labor movement gave him a far deeper insight into Soviet intentions than the intellectuals who ridiculed him.

Herbert Morrison who succeeds Bevin was at one time his main rival. He was the second giant of the Labour Party, the leader of London and the spokesman of the local parties who feared and resisted trade-union domination. He was not Bevin's choice. Yet he has all of Bevin's driving will, and in addition a mildness, a kindness, a sense of humor and of tolerance that places him close to the heart of British character. His common sense will stand out in world diplomacy. But come election time he will be aching to be back in headquarters, prodding the party workers along.

SENATE OKS UMS

The Defense Department got closer to a green light for its manpower plans last week when the Senate voted all the essential provisions for Universal Military Service by majorities which surprised even Administration leaders. On the final 79-5 vote, only a small core of Republican isolationists stood against the bill. Democrats and internationalist Republicans beat back one scuttling amendment after another, forcing the isolationists to carry the losing fight into the House, where the Republican Policy Committee has voted to try to pin the sorry remnant of the "Great Debate" argument—"no troops abroad without Congress' approval"—to the bill.

The Senate debate concerned itself less with the specific provisions of the bill than with broad limits to the program. Sen. Wayne Morse (R, Oreg.) pushed a fight to limit the total size of the armed forces and succeeded in getting a four million man limit adopted. But both this move and Sen. Robert Taft's proposal to set a time limit for the legislation, which was beaten 58-30, were backed mainly by conservatives. Democratic liberals apparently felt that, in view of the isolationist clamor, they had to support the Administration's full plan for military manpower all the way.

In the House, the Armed Services Committee led by powerful Carl Vinson (D, Ga.) has given UMS longer and more critical examination. Vinson's plan is to set up a study commission to plan for a permanent Universal Military Training program; the Senate version would make a UMT program automatically operative after the present "emergency" ends. The House will also favor a time limit, as well as a provision allowing Congress to stop inductions by concurrent resolution. The Senate version provides for Congressional "review" only every five years.

The two bills also differ in some of their figures. The Senate cut the Defense Department's request for a 27 month induction period to two years, while the House committee compromised on 26 months. But the Senate kept the minimum induction age at 18, while the House version fixes it at 18-and-a-half. The Upper Chamber also made more generous provisions for sending inductees for college training and increasing ROTC programs.

BUSINESS BEDFELLOWS

The interlocking relationships among directors of corporations have long been a major anti-trust problem. Last week, the Federal Trade Commission presented a new report on the 1,000 largest US manufacturing corporations, charging that the presence of the same persons on their various boards of directors still remains a major "threat to competition."

Among the outstanding interlocks brought out in the reports were: Armour & Company, interlocked with the third and fourth largest packers, and both Armour and Swift & Company have direct interlocks with equipment manufacturers; six of 12 grain-mill products companies, including General Mills, Best Foods, and Pillsbury Mills, have interlocking relations with competitors; US Steel maintains indirect interlocks with 11 other members of the industry; Standard of New Jersey, Socony-Vacuum Oil Company, the Texas Company, Standard of California, Standard of Indiana, Gulf Oil Corporation, are closely tied together by indirect interlocks or by joint ownership of affiliates.

FTC Chairman, James M. Mead, who presented this report to the House Subcommittee on Monopoly, said that on the basis of the facts disclosed, the FTC has concluded that "Section 8 of the Clayton Act does not adequately cope with the competition-reducing effects of interlocking directorates in ordinary manufacture and commerce." The present law is weak, Mead said, because:

1. It can be so easily evaded as to be scarcely worth enforcing. The law is violated if a director of one large concern is also a director of a large competitor. When the directors of General Steel Castings, American Steel Foundries and Baldwin Locomotive were questioned about interlocking directorates, one company simply substituted two vice-presidents and a comptroller for previous directors. Thus the new arrangement met the requirements of the Clayton Act. But, Mead said, there is no reason to believe that the closeness of the executive and policy-making ties between the three companies was in any way reduced by the changes.

2. It is applicable only to direct interlocks as distinguished from indirect interlocks. Often two or more competitors have directors who sit jointly on the board of a third company. For example, Standard Oil Company of Indiana, Standard Oil Company of California, Gulf Oil Corporation, and the Continental Oil Company, all have directors on the board of the Chase National Bank. When several competitors are represented on the board of a bank which finances them all, there is a strong probability that the indirect relationship will impair competition.

3. It makes no attempt to prevent injuries to competition that may be produced through interlocking relationships between suppliers and customers. These relationships are common since they give the customer assurance of supplies on favorable terms and give the supplier assurance of an outlet for his produce.

Mead recommended that Congress by these three methods tighten the Clayton Act against evasion. The Federal Trade Commission is now preparing a draft of legislation designed to accomplish this purpose.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WASTED FARM POWER

With utilization of manpower and full production two of the key mobilization aims today, a Senate report reveals that underproductivity in agriculture is depriving the nation's labor force of more than 2.5 million workers. This significant study, prepared under the direction of Sen. John Sparkman (D, Ala.), challenges the nation to develop a Point Four program right here at home "in many rural areas where output, productivity and living standards are now distressingly low." It emphasizes that the production and output of rural people could be increased some 20 to 25 percent if rural families now underutilized could be employed to produce as much as the worker on the medium-sized family farm, or the average rural non-farm worker.

Out of a total of nearly six million farm families, the report points out, there are approximately one million whose total value of farm production, including farm products used in the home, was under $1,500 in recent years. The average value of products produced was $867. The report says that "workers on these small-scale farms are only one-third as productive as workers on the medium-sized commercial family farms."

There are about 600,000 farmers, with a minimum of outside employment or income, whose total farm production was between $1,500 and $2,500. "Workers on these small farms are only 60 percent as productive as workers on the medium-sized commercial family farms." Another 400,000 part-time farmers, with combined farm and non-farm incomes of less than $2,000, are only 50 percent as productive as the average rural non-farm family. If fully employed, they would add approximately 900,000 workers to the labor force.

The report recommends a three-fold program: the adoption of full measures to increase productivity and output per worker on existing farms; an expanded Government program to increase the size of the farms operated by families; and a program which will allow rural underemployed people to find employment in agriculture or in industry where they can be utilized to the fullest.

CALIFORNIA'S "GREAT DEBATE"

A young man studied a card which carried a picture of Gerald L. K. Smith and the details of a mass meeting, then bought a ticket to "The Trial of Dean Acheson." An elderly woman waiting in the lobby asked a passerby if "Reverend" Smith would be there. Another man declared, "He [Acheson] is guilty as hell, that's all I gotta say."

These people were a part of the Los Angeles "jury" which voted on February 21 to impeach Secretary of State Acheson for "betraying his country." More than 800 persons had gathered to pass judgment on Acheson in a mock courtroom in which a real live judge, the court clerk, stenographer and 99 percent of the jury were friends of the accusers—the Wage Earners Committee of the USA, an anti-labor "front" organization. The WEC, announcing the trial, described it as "a living drama of subversion in high places." In smaller type the Committee gave assurances that the facts would be "judged impartially."

Unconvinced of the Committee's impartiality, John M. Ennis, attorney and former Pacific Coast director of the OPA ration boards, withdrew as defense attorney, charging that the Committee was "so prejudicial that any fair hearing on the merits of our foreign policy would now be impossible", to participate would mean becoming a party to a "thoroughly un-American trial by smear tactics."

The WEC invited nearly 100 lawyers to take Ennis' place, all of whom declined on ethical grounds or pleaded previous commitments. R. A. McConnon, executive director of the group, remarked: "We have had numerous persons who wanted to defend Acheson. . . . Our main difficulty has been in getting someone without a Communistic background."

The sponsors finally settled on Charles A. Sunderlin, a retired lawyer, who on three hours' notice agreed to tangle with State Sen. Jack B. Tenney, California's veteran headhunter, of all things and persons, "un-American." By curtain time, in deference to rising resentment over the participation of Superior Court Judge Samuel R. Blake as presiding judge of the proceedings, the program was no longer being called a "trial," but a "friendly town meeting."

At the mock bar of justice Senator Tenney argued in favor of the resolution he has introduced in the state legislature, to memorialize the House of Representatives to indict Acheson and present a demand for his impeachment to the Senate. He listed 36 counts of treasonable activity by Acheson, "all of which can be documented by history and the record."

Sunderlin turned out to be a "straight man" for Tenney's tragi-comedy routine: "We just need a little patience until Acheson . . . is removed from office, so why waste time and effort trying to impeach him?"

Midway in Sunderlin's speech, a minority member of the audience, John Despol of the California CIO Council, demanded that he be allowed to defend Acheson, insisting that the trial was a fraud, that the accusers had chosen both the prosecutor and defender. Several Committee aides escorted Despol from the stage.

The summations which followed were as enlightening as the previous arguments. Said Sunderlin: "The issue narrows down to peace, don't-cha know?" Said Tenney: "I don't know Dean Acheson from a load of hay, but personally I think he's ruining my country." Then the audience voted 793 to 13 in favor of impeaching the Secretary of State.

Judge Blake attempted to thank the audience for their courtesy, but his words were barely audible. The audience was too busy shouting and jeering at Despol who was departing from the scene of the trial. The "great debate" on US foreign policy had reached its lowest ebb.

Los Angeles HANNAH BLOOM

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OUTSIDE AMERICA

SHIFT IN THE COLD WAR

The British historian Arnold Toynbee came back from a tour of the United States with a suggestion about the aim of his country's policy in Washington. The chronicler of the rise, the fall and, in a number of cases, the disappearance of some 26 civilizations of the past said the British slogan should be, "No annihilation without representation."

For the British people, and even more for the French, the formula seems to put the present "time of troubles" in its proper, historically realistic frame of reference. The risk for Europe is literally the annihilation of nations as they now exist, even if the apocalyptic foresight of atomic destruction turns out to be exaggerated. And if the Europeans are to be won or weaned away from the escapist myth of neutralism, in its various forms from apathy to defeatism, the component elements of this risk must be constantly, fully, accurately represented in the councils of the American Government. For fate, which to President Truman is the donor of American leadership, means to Europeans the real possibility of utter destruction because of an American miscalculation of the elements of the risk.

American statesmen who grow impatient with the Europeans need constantly to be reminded, as André Siegfried points out in the *Figaro* of Paris, that the danger of national annihilation is not based for the French, as it is for most Americans, merely on anxiety-laden flights of imagination into a terrible future. It is based on personal and living memories of a near miss in the recent past. Americans may now have the kind of faith in their future that made the British only recently sure there would always be an England. After what has happened physically in Korea as the result of a series of miscalculated risks—Stalin's, Mao's and MacArthur's—few Europeans can have such faith in the future of their nations.

For Europeans David Bradley's warning that "there's no place to hide" is literal. The fact that there is no building of shelters in Western Europe, that there are no air-raid drills, has nothing to do with apathy or defeatism. The only defenses are measures to prevent war, or if such measures fail, steps to break the enemy's will to wage war.

What is happening in Europe now is a shift from the cold war to a war of morales or a war of wills. And in this contest General Eisenhower, who was largely responsible for getting it started, is thus far doing well. Before the General introduced the morale war, the cold war as conducted by Americans unable or unwilling to recognize European realities had become on the Western side a descending spiral in which European defeatism and American retreatism were intensifying each other. Neither the European neutralists nor the American isolationists have spoken their last word. But since Eisenhower took over, more and more Europeans, especially Frenchmen, have been acquiring confidence in his willingness and ability to get some real representation in Washington for the European point of view. This is important because the French remain the most nationalistic of the continental European peoples; and a determining element in French neutralism has been the feeling that France was neither adequately nor properly represented in the making of policy upon which her national survival depends.

The French did not want the Germans to be rearmed *first*, the Americans did not want American forces in Europe to be augmented *first*, and Eisenhower made an affirmation of the double negative, giving the French the impression that they were to be the *first* chosen instrument of a policy aimed less at preventive military war than morale war.

Versailles, not a German town, is to be his main headquarters, and all the political, economic and military agencies of the Atlantic powers in Europe are to be based in or near Paris—for example, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Defense Production Board. The bridgehead for the service of supplies from America to Western Europe is in the neighborhood of La Pallice, the southwestern French region just north of the bulwark of the Pyrenees—on French soil but well away from the big cities. Seven new American air bases are being built in French Morocco—on the soil of an area of French control but just the right distance from metropolitan France to permit hitting the enemy *before* he reaches France.

There are reports, gratifying to the French, that if war must come in Europe, Eisenhower's strategy will be a Central European version of the Battle of the Bulge—to strike at the flanks of the enemy advancing toward France, from Yugoslavia on the southeast and from Scandinavia across the Baltic states on the northwest. The renewed Soviet pressure in Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia is taken as a confirmation.

The French Left suspects that, in support of Eisenhower's policy in Europe, their present government will use its new-found high prestige in Washington as a cover for "deals" with rather old-fashioned colonialism in the African and Asiatic bulwarks of the "French Union"—still not much more than a euphemism for the French Empire. In the name of military expediency, Gen. Alfonse Juin and Gen. de Lattre de Tassigny (both of whom are rated highly by Eisenhower) may put brakes on the movements toward democratic nationalism in Morocco and Indo-China. And Premier René Pleven (whose success in Washington was predicted in Outside America, *NR*, September 25, 1950) will know how to justify their conduct to the Americans. But colonialism in Africa and Asia is generally regarded—especially if it is a temporary expedient—as a lesser evil than the threat of annihilation in European France. And the importance of the new psychological attitude which Eisenhower's successful morale warfare is bringing into being is that it is gradually taking the place of the *sauve qui peut* attitude; more and more Frenchmen believe that through a unity of proportioned sacrifices real saving *en commun* is possible—at least the saving of the essentials.

Paris PERCY WINNER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LEAD-PIPE OF LABOR "PEACE"

by Guy Nunn

LEAD-PIPE is cheap, abundant and put to many uses at the Detroit-Michigan Stove Company. That became clear at the Kefauver Crime Investigating Committee's Detroit hearings.

A decision of unwitting inspiration permitted the hearings to be broadcast and televised. The result was virtually paralyzing, the most intense audience concentration in TV's history, the most fascinating, and in some ways the most ominous, spectacle ever witnessed.

Expecting a routine parade of uncommunicative and portly beneficiaries of the numbers and other rackets to be paraded before the cameras and Committee Counsel John Burling's gimlet eye, the audience was transfixed for two days by the sight of two of Detroit's most respected and best-known industrialists squirmingly pleading guilty (by evasion) to a commercial alliance with Santo Perrone, the city's most notorious Sicilian gang leader. The following is the outline of the story developed by the committee and established by the evidence which makes up its Detroit record.

In 1934, a brief and bloody strike took place at the Detroit-Michigan Stove Company, run by John A. Fry. The strike, called by the Mechanics Educational Society of America for recognition, was broken partly by the police but largely by the Perrone brothers, whom Fry requested to run in a sufficient number of scabs to man the plant. Reaching as far west as Chicago for obliging thugs, the Perrones quickly killed the strike.

Fry, then general manager, now president of the company, rewarded the energetic Sicilians by giving Santo the company's scrap and salvage business for a purely nominal price and handing to Ispano Perrone its core-making contract, thus, in effect, turning over an entire company division to his tender mercies. Although prospering mightily from these awards, the Perrones could not resist continuing into the post-prohibition era a large-scale bootlegging business, finally falling sufficiently afoul of the Bureau of Internal Revenue to receive six-year sentences at Leavenworth. Thanks to the diligence of President Fry, who kept their stove-company incomes intact by continuing to contract with their wives during their incarceration, the brothers were paroled a bare two years later, despite official advice that they be obliged to serve their full terms.

In 1937, while the Perrones were still in Leavenworth, a vigorous United Auto Workers' organizing campaign culminated in the negotiation of a better than middling contract with the stove company. But with the release of the Perrones in 1939, the beatings and head-crackings recommenced and again the union was destroyed.

John Fry had been for years a close friend of William Dean Robinson, general manager and later president of the Briggs Manufacturing Company. Through 1944 Briggs was down more often than not with an incredible series of wildcat strikes, many of which were the obvious product of mailed-fist management (the company's personnel director, Fay Taylor, was of the "treat 'em rough" school); others of these now appear, in retrospect, to have been artificially manufactured. In March, 1945, a young man named Carl Renda invaded the office of the Briggs superintendent of salvage and informed him that he wanted to see the bids of Briggs' would-be scrap contractors for the coming quarter. George Herbert, the superintendent, ordered him out of his office. A few days later, Herbert was called into the office of his superior, the director of purchases, and was informed that Renda would be given the bulk of the company's scrap business. Herbert protested. He had investigated Renda and found him utterly lacking in knowledge of the scrap business. A call to Renda's telephone number had brought Santo Perrone to the phone. Besides, the company's dealings with its incumbent dealers had been entirely satisfactory for nearly 20 years. William Cleary, the director of purchases, led Herbert to understand that there was nothing to be done about it. "An order" had come down that Renda should be given the scrap and that was it. A shame-faced Herbert complied, swallowing his tongue when informed that "his job or his life" was at stake. For a time Renda was permitted to see the scrap bids of his competitors, and then to file bids fractionally over the highest.

The firms which had generally handled the Briggs scrap, worth perhaps two million dollars a year, continued without interruption to haul it. Renda had merely inserted himself as a broker, forcing the old dealers to pay him a royalty. His first year's reported take was more than $100,000 in net profit, earned without lifting a finger. Conservative estimates by company officials have put Briggs' monthly loss through the Renda deal at better than $14,000.

Boiling, George Herbert watched his company yield to what he assumed was a Perrone shake-down. That assumption gave way quickly, however, to a more cogent explanation. A series of brutal and all but fatal lead-

Guy Nunn, a former federal official, is now a well-known political commentator on Station WDET in Detroit.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pipe sluggings of local union members had begun almost immediately after Herbert was ordered to "go along" with Renda. Profoundly disturbed, Herbert patched his suspicions together, prepared a report on the company's losses due to the Renda deal and went to the FBI. Briggs, at the time, was still producing in part under Government contract and the FBI was more interested in the fact that the Government was losing money on *its* portion of the Briggs scrap through the abandonment of competitive bidding than it was in the more lethal aspects of the arrangement. The company promptly paid up on the Government's theoretical loss, but Herbert was abruptly discharged after more than a generation of almost fanatically devoted service.

In the fall of 1946, Emil Mazey, then a UAW regional director with jurisdiction over Briggs Local 212, whose militant followers were the victims of the mysterious sluggings, prevailed upon a one-man grand jury then investigating "labor rackets" to look into the beatings. Circuit Judge George B. Murphy, the Grand Juror, obliged. The proceedings were secret. For more than four years the transcript of the testimony before him lay buried. It was only when the Kefauver committee came to Detroit in February of this year and requested Judge Murphy to make the Briggs investigation record available that the public got a glimpse of the facts. The committee used the Murphy transcript as the basis for its own recapitulation of the Briggs story, and Detroit was treated to a spectacle in which two of its most revered company presidents went shifty, pled ignorance, poor recollection, were menaced with contempt citations and egregiously perjured themselves.

Undeveloped by the committee in its slap-dash visitation was a phase of the Murphy grand jury record which will give those students of labor relations, who are convinced that the Age of Reason has arrived, some cause to look again. As late as 1946, the testimony indicates, a so-called "master plan" was being launched to paralyze trade unions in Detroit, a plan based on a formula of picking off the primary and corrupting the secondary leadership. Whether the "master plan" was peddled by the ubiquitous Sam Perrone or by his big-industry colleague, John Fry, or by someone even bigger, is not yet clear. In any event, testimony before the Murphy grand jury establishes that it did exist, that Perrone was a possessor of a written copy of it, that the design was to proceed from Briggs, to Ford, thence Chrysler, and eventually to other industrial centers in other states. The record shows that Perrone and his front, Renda, did visit the Ford Motor Company in that year, following preliminary discussions with Harry Bennett. Apparently only a freak of coincidence prevented the deal's consummation. A Ford salvage official, tipped off by Herbert that the Perrone invasion was forthcoming and having learned authoritatively that the Bennett regime, tottering for months, was at the edge of collapse, took it upon himself to run Renda and Perrone out of River Rouge. This stopped the Chrysler arrangement and would indicate that Bennett was pivotal in the plan's broader scope.

The UAW is now faced with the task of rooting out the Perrone group over managerial opposition. Secretary-Treasurer Mazey, who is also the UAW Briggs Department director, has formally demanded of Walter O. Briggs Sr. that the Renda scrap contract be voided and company President William Dean Robinson removed. Renda's grip is strong enough to have driven Robinson twice to humiliating perjury to protect their mysterious compact and to have forced the company to endure serious losses for nearly five years.

The UAW's concern over the Kefauver committee revelation goes beyond mere alarm that a major auto industry firm has, in effect, formally contracted for the services of a terrorist gang. Terror is too primitive a weapon to break so powerful a union. There are subtler and perhaps more effective weapons, however, than a piece of lead pipe. Renda's income-tax returns, for example, claim exemptions for lavish expenditures in "entertaining" shop committeemen and stewards, and the record shows that Perrone, too, has been at times as disposed to entice as to threaten. When the underworld is permitted to batten on legitimate business, its transition from servant to master may be abrupt, and the greased palm may prove a better weapon than brass knuckles. Perrone and his clan are already substantial, if not controlling, stockholders in Detroit-Michigan Stove.

The peculiarly violent reaction of the Detroit Board of Commerce to the Kefauver committee's hearings, the attacks by Michigan's Republican attorney general on the "legality" of its having released the Murphy grand jury transcript, the virtual boycott of the committee's findings by two of Detroit's dailies, combine to persuade the union's leadership that the fleeting Kefauver probe of the Perrone gang's infiltration of big business has touched an acutely sensitive spot on Michigan's body economic.

The UAW and virtually every other organization in the Detroit community want the Kefauver committee to return, loaded for bear. There is big game stalking the industrial jungle, and it will take more than a two-day peashooter of an investigation to bring it down. The baffling failure of local and state police, aided by the FBI, to solve the attempted assassinations of Walter and Victor Reuther, despite the largest rewards in history, now seems less baffling; it becomes ominously comprehensible. The Black Hand, at least in legend, can never be caught, but what about the hand that pays it?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TERROR IN TEXTILES

by Jean Begeman

SOME 200,000 cotton and rayon workers in 470 mills have been instructed to prepare for strike action this week if no agreement can be reached on a new contract. The heightened anti-labor attitude of Southern textile employers makes the possibility of a peaceful settlement even more improbable today than in the past. Negotiations between the textile companies and the Textile Workers Union of America-CIO which have been underway for some time show no progress in the Southern mills. Meanwhile 70,000 woolen workers, mostly in the New England area, are out on strike, and defense needs for woolen, cotton and rayon goods are piling up.

At this moment of tension in the textile industry a revealing report, by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, documents case histories of anti-union terrorism of textile workers. Strikebreakers, company-dominated unions, kidnapping and forcible eviction of labor organizers—all old labor-busting devices—are being used freely today in Southern towns to stunt the growth of textile worker unionization. The report may never be released in its original form.

Textile employers have invoked the injunction provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act so successfuly since its passage in 1947 that union organization is at a standstill. Only 15 percent of the textile workers in the South ever joined a union and membership is dropping. The subcommittee found that for all practical purposes "self-organization and collective bargaining are steadily losing ground" in the Southern mills. "The retreat of union organization is being compelled by employer campaigns on an area-wide front," the report reveals. "Much of this campaign is being conducted in shocking violation of the Labor-Management Relations Act, and the National Labor Relations Board appears to be powerless to cope with the situation."

The textile industry now has a million or more workers. Eighty percent of the industry is located in the South and 20 percent in New England. Twenty-five years ago these percentages were reversed. Many textile manufacturers have found the South friendly territory in which to spread their propaganda that local labor should be protected from such alien ideas as unionism. They have received the co-operation of local chambers of commerce, civic leaders, ministers and even the state police and the National Guard in their efforts to kill labor organization in the mills.

Methods used by textile employers to stop union campaigns, the report says, include: surveillance of organizers and union adherents; propaganda through rumors, advertisements, speeches to the employees; denial of free speech and assembly to the union; organization of the whole community for anti-union activity; labor espionage; violence and gun-play; the closing or moving of the mill; endless litigation before the NLRB and the courts. And if these tactics fail the report says, "The employer will try to stall, in slow succession, first the election, then the certification of the union, and finally the negotiation of a contract. Few organizing campaigns survive this type of onslaught."

The subcommittee details five case studies by the committee on anti-union techniques used at the American Enka Corp., Morristown, Tenn.; Anchor Rome Mills, Rome, Ga.; the American Thread Co., Tallapoosa, Ga.; Celanese Corp., Rome, Ga.; and the concerted effort of the Anderson Citizens' Committee, Anderson, S. C., to stop organizing campaigns in textile plants in that area. Open hearings were held in each case and every effort was made to afford labor and management representatives equal opportunity to present their views. (The printed hearings total 1,402 pages.) In two of the case studies—the Anchor Rome Mills and the American Enka Corporation—the unions were destroyed. The Celanese Corporation, after a five-month struggle, was unable to break the strike at its Rome, Ga., plant.

Last summer Sen. James E. Murray (D, Mont.), chairman of the subcommittee, and Sen. Hubert Humphrey (D, Minn.) held hearings in Morristown, Tenn., on the Enka strike, a classic example of how an employer with the aid of local peace officers and the National Guard can destroy a union. Enka, a Dutch-controlled corporation which produces rayon tire yarn, opened its Morristown plant in 1948 and, a year later, the Textile Workers Union (CIO) won an election and was certified as a collective-bargaining agent. During that year, 75 grievances were filed and eight were submitted to arbitration. Workload, wage increase and fringe benefits were the principal unresolved issues when labor and management met to negotiate in February, 1950. On March 28, the strike began and was uneventful for about six weeks. But then the company began sponsoring hourly radio broadcasts in a back-to-work movement, emphasizing that police protection was available to those employees who wished to return to work. Despite the fact that there had been no violence, the company secured an injunction prohibiting the union from interfering with any person seeking entrance into the plant. On

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

May 22, some employees returned to work, entering the plant in an automobile convoy escorted by Sheriff Medlin. On May 25, stones were thrown at the caravan of cars crossing the picket line, and six people were hurt. State highway patrolmen were then assigned to the strike. Violence on the picket line brought about Governor Browning's order for the National Guard to intervene.

By mid-June about one-third of the strikers had returned to work and the company had been able to hire 241 new employees. The TWUA found it could neither protect the job rights of its members nor its own status as a labor organization. All of the forces of law had been marshaled in behalf of the company. "In the latter part of June, the community became a virtual armed camp," the report states. "On June 22, shooting occurred on the picket line. Three nonstriking employees and one striker were shot. There was a wholesale round-up of strikers. . . . The union charged that strikers were jailed, held without bail and denied counsel."

The strike ended August 18, 1950. Last November, the union's charges of unfair labor practices by American Enka were dismissed by the Atlanta Office of the NLRB; they are now pending an appeal to the General Counsel's office in Washington.

The report details unsuccessful attempts by both AFL and CIO textile unions to organize the American Thread Company mill during and after the last war. One organizer, Mrs. Edna Martin, was kidnapped from her boarding-house room by several armed men and women, bound, forced into a truck, driven out of town and finally ejected on a lonely, country road with the instruction, "Don't come back to Tallapoosa, or you will be shot on sight." She later identified her abductors, but the local grand jury refused to return an indictment.

Labor trouble at the Anchor Rome Mills in Georgia began early in 1947 when it was purchased by Alabama Mills, well-known for its anti-labor attitude. Workers at the mill had been organized two years before the ownership changed, but by the end of the year there was a marked increase in the number of grievances filed by union employees. Not only did the company ignore the grievances; but it also encouraged employees to revoke their authorizations for check-off of union dues, obligingly supplying special forms for this purpose to supervisors who actively solicited workers to sign them. Tension had reached a peak when bargaining sessions opened in February, 1948. The company demanded the deletion from the union recognition clause of any obligation to bargain "in respect to rates of pay, wages, hours of employment, and other conditions . . ." and, in addition, proposed: elimination of the check-off; prohibition of union business on mill property and authority to suspend vacation and offer vacation pay in lieu thereof. There were other such proposals. "After the strike began on March 18," the report reveals, "supervisory employees, including Paul Redmond Jr., president of Anchor Rome Mills, secured pistol permits." (The NLRB later censured this move as "the abandonment of orderly and peaceful procedures for the settlement of industrial disputes, and resort to armed conflict.") Violence and bloodshed on the picket lines followed.

The strike continued until January, 1949, when it was finally dissolved. "None of the strikers have been rehired although almost all applied for reinstatement . . . in addition (they) apparently were also blacklisted by the Southern textile industry as a whole. . . . There is no union at Anchor Rome Mills today," the report says.

The report gives many more cases of similar techniques for preventing union organization or destroying established unions. It is interesting to note that despite the fact that companies have kept over 80 percent of Southern textile workers unorganized, the labor skirmishes have caused a marked increase in the wages of workers. Companies have had to raise wages to keep the workers from moving to organized mills. Today, the wage differential between Northern and Southern textile workers is about 11.6 cents an hour, and fringe benefits are about 9.1 cents an hour higher in New England than in the South. Work loads and working conditions, however, are still far less desirable in the Southern mills.

Without listing specific recommendations, the Senate subcommittee throughout the report points up two glaring deficiencies regarding justice in textile disputes: "The alacrity with which the courts and officers of the law align themselves with the employer" indicates that the right to strike is not fully acknowledged and is frequently abridged in the South, and "the snail-like pace of the NLRB in processing cases is such as almost to completely destroy the effectiveness of administrative action."

"The ability of Southern employers to avoid collective bargaining has afforded them a substantial competitive advantage over their Northern competitors through lower wages and substandard working conditions," and, the report charges, "the attempt of Congress to define bargaining in good faith as set forth in [the Taft-Hartley Act] has had the unfortunate effect of reducing the collective bargaining process in Southern textiles to a futile formality."

Whether or not this revealing report will ever be made a public document depends upon the courage of the full Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which is now considering the subcommittee print. Certainly the ranking minority member of the Labor Committee, Sen. Robert A. Taft, will object. Published or not, the report is a valuable document.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A COMMUNICATION: The "New Statesman's" Policy

SIR: The fact that the *New Republic* should publish Richard Strout's article [March 5] shows in itself how seriously things have gone wrong between American and British liberals. I do not want to make them worse by retorting in kind to his personal attack. It will be enough if I point out the unfortunate impression made by his account of his relations with the *New Statesman and Nation*. Why does Mr. Strout say that he wrote for us "at the intercession of a friend" and left off when he had become familiar with our "prejudices"? The facts are that he agreed to write in the normal way of journalism, received payment for his articles, and must have been fully acquainted with our policy when he agreed to contribute. The conclusion drawn in this country is that this article, which mainly rehashes jokes and smears from *Time* magazine, makes no serious assessment of this journal's position but must be inspired by a desire, on the part of Richard Strout and the *New Republic*, to be clear of any taint of friendship with the *New Statesman and Nation*. But I know the *New Republic* too well to attribute to it any such unworthy motive; and, though I do not recall ever having met Mr. Strout, I am assured by those who know him that the meanness of his article is not characteristic but merely an overflow of his anger at what he feels to be the defection of many British liberals. Our anger here is due to a similar view about many American liberals.

For the sake of the record, as they say, I must first deal shortly with some of Mr. Strout's detailed criticisms. Every paper makes mistakes, and I was surprised that instead of finding new ones, Mr. Strout had to trot out a slip in the Christian name of Alger Hiss (which *Time* magazine very rightly pulled our leg about more than a year ago). What was more surprising was that, going one better than *Time*, Richard Strout changed the quotation by inserting the words "of us," so that we seemed to be falsely claiming personal acquaintance with Hiss! Even less creditable, I thought, was the smear that the *New Statesman and Nation* was really following the Communist Party line. This suggestion was made on the basis of special correspondents' articles about Italy. Again to keep the record straight, it should be said that Mr. Davidson (whom Mr. Strout also misquotes) had a distinguished record as a British parachute officer who served with Italian and Yugoslav partisans and was cited in the Rajk trial as a British spy because he had fought on the same side as Tito during the war. As for Mr. Vallance's articles which roused Mr. Strout's suspicions, his criticisms of big industrialists were mild in comparison with those made by Mr. Dayton, the American Economic Co-operation Administrator, who declared on October 19 that their attitude could not "win anything except the privilege of hanging from the arcade of a filling station." And if Mr. Vallance, who wrote critically of the "unbending doctrinaire metal" of many Italian Communists, yet recorded his conclusion that events had put leadership of the Italian working class "predominantly, as things stand, in Communist hands," I would observe that I have before me a letter from a high official of the United Nations who writes that, having toured Italy last autumn in the company of a distinguished American colleague, "our impressions coincide exactly with those of Mr. Vallance."

But Mr. Strout's smear goes further; he suggests that because our correspondents reached conclusions that were on occasion agreeable to Communists and disagreeable to the State Department, this paper was, therefore, fellow-traveling. Yet I find it hard to believe that Mr. Strout does not know if he had read the *New Statesman and Nation* as carefully as he claims—that I have frequently been personally denounced by the Soviets as various kinds of a Fascist beast; that this journal continuously attacks Soviet repression in Eastern Europe; and that last year it made very full examination of the evidence for Soviet concentration camps. I may add that I recently inquired (with a view of getting more information about Russia for the paper) whether we might share the privilege accorded to some American newspapers and to the London Sunday *Times* of having a correspondent in Moscow. I was informed that no correspondent of ours would be given a visa since we were apparently only interested in denigrating the Soviet Union.

What is the real issue behind all this tarradiddle? Mr. Strout complains that we always find America responsible for what has gone wrong in the world. On this there are two things to say. The first is that we have, on the contrary, consistently stated that Soviet intransigence is largely responsible for what seems to us the present hysterical state of mind of many Americans. Secondly, it isn't surprising if we do find American fingers in every pie, since they are in fact there. We are a socialist paper as the *New Republic* once was. Like the *New Republic*, we always attacked British imperialism and have rejoiced in Mr. Attlee's recognition of the right of colonial peoples in Asia and Africa to a new and independent life. This British repudiation of imperialism should have made co-operation easier between American and British liberals, who used to resent being attached in America on the score of an imperialism for which they weren't responsible and did not defend. Today the center of capitalist power has moved from London to Washington, and Socialists' criticism must also move from London to Washington. Some Americans, of course, understand this very well; they see that MacArthurism is more dangerous than British jingoism ever was. They write to ask why we are so mealy-mouthed in criticizing America, why, for instance, we do not deal at length with the report of the Kefauver committee, revealing the tieup between highly organized criminal syndicates and important politicians, or tell the British pub-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lic in detail about systematic corruption of city governments and police, and of scandals of American capitalism today exposed by the Fulbright report or by the Buchanan committee? So far from slinging mud at America, I have found it necessary both in the *New Statesman and Nation* and at "Peace with China" meetings that are being held all over this country elaborately to explain that MacArthurites and the Republican press only represent a small part of America, 58 percent of which according to a recent Gallup poll wanted Communist China to take its place on the Security Council.

No doubt American liberals find it difficult to understand why we do not in 1951 take the same attitude toward "collective security" as we did in 1938. The short answer is that "collective security" as applied to Spain, Italy or Germany meant concentration of power which could have prevented war, while today it seems an excuse for starting a world war with the ludicrous idea of quenching Communism by bombs. But Communism, unlike the Wehrmacht, is a world social movement which has already won its way, mainly without aid from the Red Army, over an area extending from the Oder to Vladivostok and Peking. It will spread over the rest of the world if our only notion of tackling it is to court financial and moral ruin by total rearmament of the rest of the world, including especially Germany, Japan and Franco Spain. Mr. Strout would be surprised at his reception here if he tried to explain the American theory of the United Nations to British audiences which have no sympathy with Communism but know too much about MacArthur's activities in Japan, Formosa and Korea, and about his promises to restore Chiang Kai-shek's rule to the Chinese mainland to take at face value the notion that the China war is merely to enforce the United Nations policy of "collective security." They can gather that much from *Time* magazine, which every week makes more "anti-Americans" in Europe than the *New Statesman and Nation* could do in one year.

Mr. Strout's article makes one realize how much the Atlantic has widened in the last 12 months. He laughs at us for asking whether Britain could "save America from herself." Many people of all parties in Britain believe that this was just what Mr. Attlee did, for the time being, when he visited Washington last December and urged the American Administration not to permit MacArthur to begin bombing Manchuria. Mr. Attlee's visit was made in response to overwhelming protest against MacArthur's personal policy and contempt for British protests; the House of Commons cherished the illusion that it had some right to be heard where the lives of British soldiers were concerned. But I need not pursue the question of MacArthur, whose "literary style" seems all that bothers Mr. Strout about the General. The British are more concerned about his military and political style. It is true that on one occasion the *New Statesman and Nation* made an error in speaking of "directives" to MacArthur when we referred to our account of unheeded expostulations, demarches and supplications. But since the *New Statesman and Nation* began the examination of the irresponsible position of General MacArthur, journalists in America, as well as in Britain, have taken up the matter. The case we first stated is now broadly accepted. The *New Republic* itself has been almost as strong as the *New Statesman and Nation* on the point. I need say no more about it—except to utter a warning that an attempt to make war on China and to call it "sanctions" would be regarded in Britain by people of all classes and parties as suicidal folly.

This brings me to my final point. I am ready to admit that there may have been some lack of understanding and appreciation on our side. We may not always have distinguished sharply enough between those who think in terms of the atom bomb and those who think in terms of Point Four. I am sure that we have often been testy and oversensitive, and I think we have failed to appreciate the change in American psychology that has accompanied the Korean casualty lists. But the reason why most British people—and for that matter most Europeans—seem sometimes to be "anti-American" is that while war to most Americans, since 1865, has been remote business, to us, since 1945, it has meant quite simply the threat of total destruction. The United States often talks as if she, as the strongest power, has the right to establish bases and station atom bombers where she pleases. American generals openly discuss the merits of Britain as an aircraft carrier and don't disguise their view that we may be expendable. An American Civil Defense chief said here recently that atomic bombing would be only "different in degree" from the 1940 blitz. It is such remarks that make British audiences impatient of attempts to explain and defend American policy. They are anti-Soviet for the most part, but they think, as do the *New Statesman and Nation* and Walter Reuther, that Russia relies on spreading Communism not so much by military aggression as by exploiting economic and political contradictions of capitalism and that, therefore, present MacArthurite talk of a military crusade to "liberate" half the world from Communism is a form of madness. Nobody would accuse Professor Toynbee of being anti-American or a fellow traveler, but he expressed the present mood of Britain when he returned recently from the United States with the slogan "no annihilation without representation."

KINGSLEY MARTIN, Editor
London New Statesman and Nation

SIR: There is something essentially attractive about Kingsley Martin. In his first sentence he confirms that he speaks for British liberals. I am glad to have it settled. He deplores the breach between American and British liberals; until I read this I had rather imagined that the liberals of the two countries understood each other reasonably well and that the breach was really between them and Kingsley Martin.

It is difficult to argue with a man who has a patent on liberal feelings and who feels that to express the same sentiments while arriving at a different conclusion represents an infringement. I also believe that all-out war with China would be folly; I deplore MacArthur's bombast and what I conceive to be his military mistakes, and nobody could feel

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more strongly than I that Communist defeat cannot be achieved by bombs alone. Mr. Martin must be ignorant of America or he would understand that these same views are shared by countless other friends here. In his world American capitalism still threatens British socialism without relation to the new fact that now Moscow threatens both. You would think that Moscow's rejection of a *New Statesman and Nation* reporter would shatter this out-dated concept, but split personalities are an advantage: they can believe opposites simultaneously.

Editor Martin sets off on his self-appointed mission, modestly described as to "Save America from Herself," by quoting a Gallup poll that 58 percent of Americans already agree that Communist China should join the Security Council. Ingenious Mr. Martin manages to beat us with this healthy fact, too, though it might seem to demolish his argument that America needs saving.

I again quote Norman Thomas to represent those American liberals who have anxiously searched their consciences and decided, on balance, that the Korean adventure to support collective security (which the *NS and N* once backed but now repudiates) is the correct policy.

I like to think of Kingsley Martin in the glare and excitement of one of his "Peace with China" meetings, the look of suffering nobility on his brow, "defending" America. This is all the more pleasant since I think I have never seen an agreeable thing about the United States in the *NS and N* itself. I am sure his mood of impartiality descends on the silenced crowd as he implores them not to misjudge America by the "systematic corruption of city governments" and the like.

On November 11 the *NS and N* declared with finality that MacArthur had defied the UN directive in crossing the 38th Parallel. This charge was made despite the fact that it was a British delegate who introduced the October 7 UN resolution giving MacArthur his authority. I have time to pin down only this one story. On November 18 the *NS and N* more positively repeated the charge while simultaneously its columnist "Critic" wrote, "The facts we cited on our front page about his [MacArthur's] disobedience to United Nations' directives were not speculative but precise and incontrovertible." The writer declares that the UN had previously assured the Chinese that MacArthur would cross neither the 38th Parallel nor the Isthmus Line.

Now these statements are not true. They were made at the height of the bad news from Korea. They were used to mobilize sympathy for the Chinese. Has the *NS and N* from that day to this ever offered to substantiate them? Has it ever apologized for them? Yet this charge has been the keystone of its lofty argument. I would ask readers to look back at Mr. Martin's letter above and see the easy way with which he has dismissed the point.

I am afraid that in looking across the Atlantic the worthy editor confuses me with *Time* magazine which—had I really consulted it instead of my memory—would have indeed saved me from inserting two unimportant words in the Hiss quotation. I have *not* misquoted Mr. Davidson or Mr. Vallance. Mr. Martin stops short in the middle of Mr. Vallance's sentence. Here is the quotation from Mr. Vallance, published in the *NS and N* of November 4, 1950:

> I should say that the younger intellectual Communists . . . are of an unbending doctrinaire metal and that the Italian people might pay a price for their (in all probability efficient) Government. The Communist factory shop stewards and above all the older men who fought and suffered in the resistance seemed to me the salt of the Italian earth.
>
> It is with these men that the Nenni Socialists . . . have made common cause. How far they can influence the workers' *Risorgimento* now taking shape depends largely on the degree of support they secure from other Socialist parties in Europe. Again and again . . . I was asked why the British Labour Party could not see that to Italian trade unionists Saragat, Silone and Romita are names which sounded much as the names of MacDonald and Snowden sounded in the Britain of 1932. A harsh judgment it may be but it is certainly without the aid or counsel of the Right-Wing Socialist factions that the working-class movement for a new, juster and more prosperous Italy is today surging upwards.

Here is the quotation from Basil Davidson's article, "The New Risorgimento," in the *New Statesman and Nation* of May 6, 1950:

> The lineup in Italy is like nothing else in Western Europe. On one side there is the Government of De Gasperi, its roots in the past, its present strength almost exclusively in a powerful police force, in dollar subsidies and in the ever present threat of American intervention. On the other side there are the parties of the Left [i.e., the Communist Party and the Nenni Socialists] campaigning now as never before on a platform where every man of enlightened patriotism is invited to take his place. . . . It is 90 years since Garibaldi drove the Bourbons from Italy. But it may be that the forces of a new Risorgimento are now . . . at last gathering their strength.

The *Risorgimento*, remember, was Italy's great movement of liberation. Does Kingsley Martin seriously ask us to believe that men who equate the paid agents of Moscow with Garibaldi, the great patriot and democrat, are liberals?

Mr. Martin's declaration, above, that MacArthur promised to restore Chiang Kai-shek, isn't so; his belief that Attlee helped persuade MacArthur not to bomb Manchuria is silly. I might add that official US policy is to localize the Korean War in which it has shown considerable restraint in the face of 50,000 casualties by enemy forces based across the border. The *NS and N* has encouraged the spread of the war by enlisting sympathy for the Chinese aggressors.

All this has been done by Mr. Martin from the highest possible motives. I cannot but yield him my mede of reverence. In friendly farewell I would urge Mr. Martin to condition himself for the better American understanding he so sincerely seeks by the following two precepts:

Try to remember that because a thing is in *Time* magazine the exact opposite is not necessarily true.

Reflect that an argument is not won by repeating "MacArthur."

RICHARD L. STROUT

[Comment by the editors on this correspondence appears on page 5 of this issue.]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HAROLD L. ICKES: *Pearson's New Public Service*

NOW FOR the first time has Drew Pearson undertaken a distinct public service. In suing Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy of Wisconsin and 10 co-defendants for smearing, libel and other improper and unlawful acts, Mr. Pearson is entitled to the sympathetic support of every decent American who tries to live in the honorable American tradition despite the witch-hunters and the hysteria and fear that they foment.

It may be assumed that McCarthy will plead immunity when he is confronted in court with the mendacious and baseless charges that, on numerous occasions, he has made against Pearson. This, of course, will be the act of a man so yellow that he possesses not a vestige of courage. To be sure, in making his false and libelous charges of Communistic sympathies, if not of actual participation in Communist activities, against Pearson on the floor of the Senate, this throw-back from Wisconsin more than once beat his chest and insisted that he would repeat his outrageous charges on some occasion when his Senatorial immunity, that he now will doubtless plead, would not avail him. But while pretending this, he was only trying to kid the people into believing that he would perform as would a man of character and courage. Despite his protestations, he lost no time in skulking down the alley of immunity whenever a suit for libel was suggested. Drew Pearson even offered to pay McCarthy's court costs and legal fees if he would stand up in court in front of a suit for libel and try to justify as truth the reckless and repetitious lies that he had told. But McCarthy would have none of this, even without cost to himself. As shown by his subsequent bar-room behavior when he was a guest at a dinner at the Sulgrave Club, McCarthy was wedded to the conviction that "he who fights and runs away will live to fight another day."

Now it would seem that McCarthy's luck is on a vacation. Not only is he to be given a chance in court either to plead immunity or to defend himself against the serious charges that Drew Pearson has filed against him, he will have as his co-defendants, Fulton Lewis Jr., Westbrook Pegler and certain other obscure persons who are charged with helping to collect and throw the slime with which Pearson has been smeared. One would almost be tempted to immunize himself with a strong disinfectant and be present that eagerly anticipated day in the US District Court to behold McCarthy, *et al*, plead guilty or not guilty. Whichever way they plead will be healthy for a public that believes in fair play and decency, that does not like to see a US Senator on the floor of the Senate hit anyone below the belt, let alone such a man as Drew Pearson who has struck so many lusty blows for the public good. That McCarthy will leave no shady trick unused in trying to avoid the just disgrace that will be his if he loses this suit is not to be doubted. A man who habitually attempts to evade his state income taxes, a man whose conduct as a Circuit Court Judge in Wisconsin merited the censure of the Bar Association and the supreme court of his state, a man whose influence upon his close associates is morally corroding is not likely to fail to use any method, however devious, to escape the consequences that he has justly earned.

McCarthy will undoubtedly plead immunity, as another would intoxication, as an excuse for his wanton violations of the law. But I gravely suspect that when the famous case of *Pearson* v. *McCarthy, et al*, reaches the Supreme Court of the United States, as it will doubtless do, he will find that the immunity prescribed in the Constitution, in order to permit members of Congress to engage freely in debate upon measures affecting the public interest, is not immunity to attack recklessly individuals in connection with whom there is not the slightest thought of legislation.

Nor does the immunity granted by the Constitution protect from such appropriate court action as has been instituted by Drew Pearson an attack upon a citizen's means of livelihood. It might be one thing for McCarthy to indulge in his customary blackguardism against Drew Pearson personally. But my guess is that he may find that it is an entirely different thing to follow up his innuendos and lies by addressing himself to the sponsors of Drew Pearson's broadcast and, in effect, threatening them if they continue their contract with him. Here is a case where Mr. Pearson can show actual heavy monetary loss. Not only did McCarthy, in effect, threaten the manufacturers of Adam hats; he warned away any prospective substitute sponsors. Not satisfied with destroying this lucrative business arrangement, he went further and did everything within his power by persuasion and covert threat to induce the newspapers that subscribe to Drew Pearson's widely read column to desist from printing it.

It will take the Supreme Court itself to persuade me that the writers of the Constitution ever meant the theory of immunity to protect a member of Congress from such deliberate villainies as have been invented and indulged in by the Wisconsin Senator, Joseph "Ranting" McCarthy.

HAROLD L. ICKES

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS IN REVIEW

THE BUGS THAT BITE IN THESE MESSY TIMES

by Percy Winner

THE AGE OF LONGING, by Arthur Koestler (Macmillan; $3.50).

AT A Bastille-night fête in the mid-fifties, as at night in Paris at all times in almost any novel written about Paris for the American best-seller lists, sex comes first. On page three of Koestler's entry, Hydie Anderson, recognizably the heroine and of course American, accidentally pokes her elbow against the nose of Fedya Nikitin, the villain and of course Russian. A drop of blood glistens "viscous purple" on Fedya's upper lip, and "for a moment Hydie had an almost irresistible impulse to lick that drop off with her tongue. It seemed such a natural thing to do that she only just checked herself in time, and her aversion against the stranger became even more pronounced."

The id-versus-ego conflict has begun, and as readers of psychoanalytico-political pulp fiction will understand at once, it will lead to great jobs of viscous-purple love-making and talk about love-making. But what becomes clear only a few chapters later is that Koestler is using the inevitable *affaire* as a symbolic vehicle for his interpretation of the Cold War.

Except for the stilted, mechanical counterpoint between the heroine and the villain, flashbacks into their pasts and descriptions of the persons and places whose influence dictates their future, there is no clear thematic action. Nothing really happens except that the escapism of most of the puppets—a basic motif which at the start is a matter of fantasy—becomes at the end a matter of physical flight from a presumably doomed Paris. War has started. It *had* to start because, as the political aspects of *The Age of Longing* make quite clear, the author knows all the prescriptions and panaceas for peace and does not believe in any of them.

There are the broadest hints that the characters are meant to be versions of such French intellectuals as Malraux, Sartre, Merleau-Ponty and others of similar idea-making caliber (and conversational fire-power). But Koestler must have been listening to himself on the occasions when he might have been hearing them, for his Danubian intellectualism is as hard to fit into a Parisian setting as the English word "longing" is to translate into French (or other Latin languages).

Hydie's father, the American colonel who can be spotted at once as strong and wise because he talks rather less than the oral types Koestler has gathered in a Parisian intellectual ghetto that never was, notes that two kinds of bugs are biting in "these messy times" which are "this age of longing." "The trouble is," he tells Hydie, putting on "the Perplexed Liberal's expression" which she finds pathetic and endearing, "you can't save anybody who has no wish to be saved. Something has happened to Europe—God knows how it happened, but it's frightening and appalling. Do you think a whole continent can somehow lose the will to live? If that's so, then we have to clear out from here before we get contaminated by the death-bug." But Hydie, he believes, has the other kind—"the bug of longing." She "caught it when she ran away from the convent; so maybe when you get God out of your system something goes wrong with your metabolism which makes the bug more virulent."

A bit later on, Hydie's "thoughts of Fedya were neither intellectually nor erotically articulate, but almost wholly epidermic; she thought of him with her skin . . . a physical rapport existed between them, a kind of skin telepathy." But matters thicken; and soon "it was a miracle that citizen Nikitin should have succeeded where all the others failed. . . . She had never had a lover so primitive and inconsiderate, and though he never waited for or helped her ascent, he was the first who made her reach complete fulfillment."

The id, as was to be expected from the start, has taken only 212 pages to win. And the triumph, as well as the previous defeats because the other lovers had tried mere tact and skill against "the invisible barrier of guilt," are described in several pages of clinical lyricism *à la* Lady Chatterley.

Flaubert's poor Emma Bovary, who also had the bug of longing, though a long time ago and for rather different reasons, found in adultery only the platitudes of matrimony. But Koestler's Hydie Anderson finds in fornication (and here is the id with a difference) the ecstasy of utter—oh, purple viscous bloody utter—submission to faith. "A shiver ran down her spine, for she suddenly remembered the only other person of whom she had known by instinct that he could make her respond in the same way, though she had never consciously thought of him as a man: it was her confessor in the convent school." What the agent of the Devil and the servant of God had in common was "their faith which made surrender to them an act of humility and devotion, free of guilt; which enabled them to lift her up, limp and willing, into their safe and fertile world where all doubts were dispelled."

The ego, however, does not take it lying down. In one of their conversations, Hydie discusses with Fedya the mystery of her personality. She has, she says, "a woman's body, a man's brains, the aspirations of a saint and the instincts of a harlot." Fedya comments, "There is no mystery, only reflexes." At this point he "slowly stretched out his arm and his hand gripped her with firm pressure under the left armpit, his thumb pressing against her nipple. . . . She felt her

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

eyeballs turn upward, the familiar, blissful convulsion, then peace."

But Fedya does not leave well enough alone; he is after all a villain, a tool of the Devil, and such men cannot leave a woman in peace—for long. " 'What do you think now of Professor Pavlov?' he said politely." Pavlov, Hydie knows, was a man who concerned himself with dogs, male and female. In a split second, she realizes that Fedya is a monster, at least a person who has never understood her kind of bug. Her ego reasserts itself. She flees, out, out, into the snowy night. In the street, she scoops up a handful of snow, rubs her face with it, feels "clean again."

If the *affaire* were not the symbol of Koestler's Cold War, that might be the fitting end. But she has to come back. She listens to Fedya's taunts. "To kill, one must believe in something. . . . For politics, for ideological reasons you cannot do it, because there is nothing in the name of which you could do it. To kill, one must have a clean conscience." Naturally, Hydie, who has been purified by the driven snow (and illuminated by vast quantities of political explanation by a dozen Koestlerian mouthpieces), shoots him. "Then she felt unaccountably happy and knew that it had been the only sensible act in her life. Then this certitude evaporated as if it had never been there, and she fell back into a despair so bottomless as she had never thought within the capacity of human experience."

Koestler's "Paris in the mid-fifties" has little resemblance to the Paris of today, equally little to any Paris—intellectual or otherwise—which this reviewer, boy or man, has known for more than thirty years. In its martinis the olives float; and the word *normalien* is used to mean the graduate of *any* normal school, instead of meaning (as a man who knew Paris would know) the graduate of one and only one school, in the rue d'Ulm in Paris. On the other hand, the torrents of talk in *The Age of Longing* dredge up—in the accurate, if tiresome, jargon of the *métier*—more of the grotesque and farcical clichés about the myths of intellectualoid Paris current in the Koestlerian intellectualoid ghettos than can be found within the covers of any other recent book.

Much of *The Age of Longing* is Céline and Malaparte watered down for Americans. Koestler loathes Communism, but still with some of the passion of the love he once felt for it, while for democracy he has a fellow-traveling, rationalized acquiescence whose component of patronizing, even sneering contempt he makes no real attempt to hide. One of the book's least pleasant aspects is a version of faith (usually offered in the Roman Catholic context) which is not only offensively ignorant and insensitive, but cheap and vulgar. The prescription for salvation amounts to little more than another handgrip of the armpit and nipple. This is a cheaply, though not deeply, defeatist book. It has nothing to do with the Parisians or the French, who are not bitten by any death-bug and whose defeatism will decrease in exact proportion as they get satisfaction of their longing for certain simple economic, political and social *biens* which Koestler quite obviously considers either absurdly old-fashioned, or despicable, or both.

Perhaps the explanation lies in one character's comment on his inability to write: "Nikitin makes the ink curdle in my pen. A single look from Nikitin's eyes makes my imagination wish to retire to a nunnery or preach a sermon—and when a writer becomes a preacher, he is finished."

SPOKESMAN FOR SANITY

A PLAN FOR PEACE, by Grenville Clark (Harper; $1).

GRENVILLE CLARK has written a bold analysis of the problems that face us in the Cold War with Russia and has proposed a number of steps which he believes will help prevent the catastrophe of a third world war. His suggestions boil down to:

1. A campaign to make the American people more aware of the devastating implications of a conflict in which atom bombs are used as weapons;

2. New efforts to obtain general disarmament without trying to separate atom-bomb disarmament from conventional weapons;

3. A general East-West settlement based on disarmament and revision of the United Nations Charter to eliminate some of its present weaknesses. This would include new voting arrangements which would base voting power on population rather than on national entity.

With far more courage than most recent commentators on foreign policy, Clark analyzes the inadequacies of present American policy, criticizes the growth of "coerced conformity" in American political and intellectual life and attacks the national tendency to regard war as all but inevitable. The author rejects a concept of world cooperation so narrow that it would be essentially a Western Democratic Alliance, and sees hope only in a determined effort to organize a world federation in which all nations would be represented—his viewpoint, in other words, is that of World Federalism rather than that of Union Now.

A Plan for Peace is an attempt to reconcile the present world strife couched on a level far above the primitive approach of so many politicians and newspapers. Nevertheless, the haunting questions still remain:

Is disarmament really the crux of the problem, as Clark says it is? Will violence cease simply because the states of the world agree to eliminate horrible weapons? Or must we search more deeply for the causes of today's rush toward disaster?

Quite aside from the extreme unlikelihood that nations, including our own, would be willing at this stage to give up their arms, is it not possible that what is needed is a more thorough soul-searching into the tremendous political, social and economic pressures that are driving mankind into slaughter? Clark himself appears conscious of this when he refers briefly to the need for social and economic reform. But until world order has been achieved, he finds it "hard to see how the best-laid plans to improve food and industrial production, the flow of trade, education, human rights . . . can make much progress."

It could be, on the contrary, that unless social and economic problems are tackled with a great deal more vigor than has been shown in the past, neither disarmament nor peace is likely to make

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

much progress. It is doubtful that the disarmament of the men of our own Wild West produced the law and order needed there for peaceful development. It is much more likely that the advancing tide of economic and social progress produced conditions that made previous anarchic disorder intolerable.

Clark, nevertheless, has written a book that is an admirably thoughtful addition to the small but growing body of expert testimony being written by Americans who do not see bigger and better atom bombs as the solution for all our woes. ALEXANDER H. UHL

Alexander H. Uhl is former Foreign Editor of the newspaper "PM."

GOD AND THE ANALYST

PSCHOANALYSIS AND RELIGION, by Erich Fromm (Yale; $2.50).

WITH DELIGHTFUL CLARITY in a usually murky field, Erich Fromm succeeds in demonstrating that the traditional conflict between psychoanalysis and religion is ill conceived. The issue is not whether a man can choose between being religious or irreligious; for, says Fromm, if religion be generally defined to include its multiple varieties, it can be shown that every man is religious in the sense that he manifests ideals, meanings and values about which he orients his activity and to which he is devoted. In terms of this definition of religion, the only choice available to a man is the selection of which religious system he will pursue, since he is incapable of living without some pattern of co-ordinates.

Hence the real issue becomes which devotional system best fosters the emergence of human potentialities. Broadly speaking, Fromm finds two types of religious orientation: the authoritarian and the humanistic. The former preaches submission and obedience of man to a force transcending himself; the latter affirms man's goodness, strength and independence. Among the examples of the authoritarian religious orientation, he lists Calvin, who teaches man to despise himself, and Jung, who advocates the individual's surrender to a higher power. The humanistic orientation finds expression, among others, in Buddha, Jesus, the Encylopedists and Freud—all of whom affirm the dignity and creativity of the individual man.

Fromm believes that Freud's attitude toward religion has been misunderstood. Freud did not regard all religions as pathological, but selectively condemned that type of religion which subjugates man to an autocratic God. As long as man clings to some transcendental authority from which he anticipates protection and fears punishment, he is tantamount to a submissive and enslaved child. Instead of genuflexion and intimidation, Freud preached the gospel of love, truth and freedom. With these ideals Fromm finds himself in agreement. Man can best realize his nature through the independent pursuit of truth and the exercise of reason and love.

At this point there appears an interesting discrepancy between Freud and Fromm as to the nature of the "truth" to be achieved. Whereas Fromm writes that on the basis of his psychoanalytic investigations he finds "convincing proof that the injunction 'Love thy neighbor as thyself' is the most important norm of living and that its violation is the basic cause of unhappiness and mental illness," Freud wrote in 1929 that "the command to love our neighbors as ourselves . . . is impossible to fulfill."

The conflict between Fromm and Freud upon this point casts doubt on the fruitfulness of continued debate about the properties of man's essence. Fromm clearly agrees with Rousseau that man is intrinsically devoted to the good and is rendered evil by factors external to himself. Freud's position, as incorporated in his later writings, tends toward the Augustinian conception of man as innately evil. But desirable and convenient as it may be to know man's essence, man's behavior, as Fromm's previous writings have shown, can be studied only in the context of a social frame of reference. It would seem more productive, therefore, to forget essences and limit the field of psychology to the attempt to establish correlations between behavior and given sets of conditions.

The disconcerting aspect of Fromm's exposition is that, on the one hand, he agrees that the character structure of man—his thoughts, feelings and attitudes—is molded by the socio-economic system in which he lives; but on the other hand, he alludes to a "self" or "soul" in man which somehow operates independent of the culture and which becomes manifest in "heroes" who assert their individuality in defiance of social values repudiating individuality. But if the self or soul is defined as a need for truth, love and freedom, is it not possible that these, too, are learned responses instead of an entelechy? Or if this point of view suggests too much emphasis upon social conditioning, may it not be likely that truth, love and freedom have no innate meanings and can express themselves only in terms of the social definitions which they receive?

Moreover, Fromm seems to condemn "adjustment" to contemporary society, as though "adjustment" denoted necessarily an acceptance of the authoritarian values of the marketplace. He does not explain why modern man cannot fulfill himself by "adjusting" or adapting to the humanistic institutions which are also evident in present society. Indeed the sole alternative would be anarchy or mysticism. MEYER H. MASKIN

Meyer H. Maskin is a Fellow of the William A. White Institute of Psychiatry and Assistant, Clinical Professor in Psychiatry at New York University.

MANHANDLED WATER

WATER, LAND, AND PEOPLE, by Bernard Frank and Anthony Netboy (Knopf; $4).

NO OTHER PEOPLE requires as much water per capita as we do, yet no other nation on earth has mismanaged its natural water system as elaborately and vigorously, frequently to the verge of disaster. About this time last year, with New York City standing in evident danger of a water famine even as new dust bowls were appearing in California, the White House appointed an emergency Water Resources Policy Commission, headed by Morris L. Cooke. Appended acknowledgments in the Cooke Report list no fewer than 209 consultants and collaborators as contributors to the findings of a commission of seven members.

The commission approach represents one way to prepare and publish a book about manhandled water. *Water, Land, and People* takes a simpler, more per-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sonal view of the same vast problem; but the conclusions of its two forester-authors are often remarkably similar to those of the President's commission.

Frank and Netboy write as individuals, with a better grasp of what is meant by the river basin, including cities and suburbs as well as farms, forests and ranges, than has distinguished the approach of any one government agency to date. They deal candidly with the difficulties and conflicts bound to arise when, for example, by erecting high dams you cover with water the richest farm bottomland and displace, as in the TVA adventure, some 70,000 farming people to sites removed from their former community institutions and way of life.

The authors are sympathetic with the TVA and would not deny, I gather, that the country is far better off for its ministrations. But as a Forest Service man who worked for a while as a forestry official for the TVA, the senior author, Frank, is sharply critical of the liberals' pipe-dream that the TVA is perfect, a social and economic panacea for the ills of waste and poverty anywhere on earth. True, the Authority has done wonders at spots in the Valley, but the management inclines to point proudly to its show places and ignore the fact that, up the coves and the smaller streams to the top of the mountains, countless lives and countless acres remain untouched.

Having worked myself for a time as a TVA writer, after like spells in the Soil Conservation Service and earlier in the Forest Service, I think I know what Frank and Netboy are talking about. The men who started the TVA going, like the men who started the SCS, are young men no longer. They have become set in their ways and, amid general applause as to the high excellence of much of their invention and striving, too complacent. No one agency, no one group, no one viewpoint on the enormous problem of wise land and water use, is sufficient—no, not even the old-time Pinchot-inspired Forest Service approach. Frank and Netboy make this plain in their stimulating, hopeful and badly needed book. RUSSELL LORD

Russell Lord is editor of "The Land," a quarterly.

ON THE AIR: From Elsinore

RADIO AND TELEVISION like to boast of their wide audience acceptance. Accuse a broadcaster of not providing enough programs of sufficient worth to warrant really large audiences most of the time, and he'll point to the "ratings" —compiled by either the Hooper or the Nielsen organization, or maybe by The Pulse, Inc. Of course, the "ratings" are impressive, for most of them begin their mathematical gymnastics by taking the number of sets tuned in at 100 percent. But how many radio or television sets are dark?

C. E. Hooper, the most zealous and in some ways the most effective of broadcasting's slide-rule boys, has just provided the answer. Hooper has issued a report on January radio listening plus TV viewing in 33 cities that are blessed with both radio and television. The average evening audiences, he discovered, were higher "than for any month previously reported in the 16 years of continuous audience reporting by the Hooper firm." He then provides figures on some of the cities "with the highest percent of set-use" during the period of the study: Cincinnati, 50.9 percent; Dayton, 50.3 percent; Milwaukee, 50.0 percent—downward to Chicago and Columbus, which were tied with 47.6 percent. Next time your local broadcaster answers your gripe with the usual "They tune in, don't they?" tell him how many sets are dark—and why.

On the other hand, when broadcasting comes through with a fine program, it is up to you to tune in. For instance, if you missed John Gielgud's "Hamlet" on Theatre Guild on the Air, you have only yourself to blame.

Theatre Guild on the Air, broadcast over NBC (radio) every Sunday night for an hour starting at 8:30, is consistently the best of the regularly scheduled dramatic programs — audeo and video. This time the Guild outdid itself. Under the direction of Homer Fickett, who has been running the program since it first went on the air on another network (ABC) six years ago, I heard a splendid "Hamlet." Gielgud did the cutting and slight adaptation to the radio format himself. Pamela Brown played the Queen, and Dorothy McGuire, Ophelia. To give Shakespeare more room on the airwaves, the program ran an extra half-hour.

You may not like Gielgud's conception of Hamlet. His prince is energetic, willing enough to act, but his energy is deflected by developments beyond his control, his actions are thwarted by "destiny" and "fate." Gielgud's Hamlet finds himself; he rises to what Gielgud conceives as a "sort of spiritual regeneration" through suffering and tragedy, to the greatness of universal man.

Sharing the hour and a half with me that night was a biologist who hates radio and insists that he never listens to the suff (which is not entirely true, for he does listen to lectures, news and some symphonic music, and his daughter has the thing bleating all the time). The scientist was amazed and, halfway through the program, said: "This is surprising; I don't even miss the stage, the people, the scenery, the lights. I can *see* them all—through this radio." That's exactly what Gielgud and Fickett brought us that night—a live "Hamlet."

There were some deficiencies. Miss McGuire's early speeches were hesitant, as if she were suffering from mike-fright, but she picked up in her next scene. Polonius was the weakest member of the cast, and it was a relief to have him done away with. The play within the play was not as effective as it usually is on the stage. But "Hamlet" itself was superb. Gielgud's cutting was admirably intelligent; you had to listen closely to catch the occasional lapses. This was radio at its best. US Steel, which sponsors the program, RCA, which pitched in to make the extra half-hour possible, and NBC deserve the thanks of the public. I hope they get it and I hope we get more such evenings on the air. SAUL CARSON

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THEATRE: Reprieve for Billy

ON SUNDAY, March 4, the day after it was scheduled to close, "Billy Budd" was granted a two-week extension of its unseemly short run. The reprieve was made possible less by a show of interest on the part of theatregoers than by the extraordinary operating economies agreed to by all concerned in the enterprise. From authors and stars to stagehands and electricians, everybody connected with "Billy Budd" was reluctant to let it die, and anyone who has seen it should be able to understand why. It is a real play, serious, engrossing and provocative of meaningful discussion; if the public now fails to come to its support, the public deserves the succession of smartly packaged devices that are rapidly becoming its staple fare. It isn't only in government that we get what we have coming to us.

There are some things wrong with "Billy Budd" as translated to the stage by Louis O. Coxe and Robert Chapman. I think almost anyone would agree with me that the text at times becomes too wordy, that the development of character is sometimes stifled by the flow of eloquence. And I think a good many people would accept my view that, in an effort to make sure their text would "play," the playwrights have gone too far in clothing Melville's austere argument in warm particularity. Melville was discussing absolutes—good as such and evil as such, and authority in the abstract—while the play concerns an innocent boy, a wicked man and a sadly troubled captain. The two sets of elements are not readily transposed, and thus it happens that the events of "Billy Budd" on the stage raise a number of questions about the probability of human behavior which are quite irrelevant to *Billy Budd* as its author conceived it.

But the fact that Coxe and Chapman resolved their problem in one way, whereas some spectators might wish they had met it in another, is part of what is meant by the excitement of the theatre. Whatever its faults, "Billy Budd" is a demonstration of disciplined imagination vigorously carried out; the performances by Dennis King, Torin Thatcher and Charles Nolte in the pivotal roles are full-bodied and challenging; Norris Houghton's direction is strong and explicit; the sets by Paul Morrison are, in line with the spirit of the play, vivid and specific without being irritatingly eye-catching, and they are spacious, workmanlike platforms for action.

This "Billy Budd" is material for a real theatre audience to get its teeth into, something to be attended closely, thought about and criticized for the benefit of one's own understanding. Of course, if there is no real theatre audience today but only dissociated playgoers who pay to be sensationalized, "Billy Budd" is reprieved in vain. It should have been set to music and staged on a garbage scow and then there would have been the idle talk that sensations thrive upon.

ROBERT HATCH

Movie note: "Of Men and Music" purports, as Deems Taylor explains in an elephantine introductory lecture, to reveal not only the artistry but the intimate personal life of a handful of prominent performing musicians. If Nadine Conner and Jan Peerce ordinarily spend their time singing arias and duets to an old night watchman in an empty opera house at midnight, and if Arthur Rubinstein, circumventing the business functions of his manager, plays half his repertory at home for anyone who would like to engage him for a concert, the script of the picture is as true as can be. Jascha Heifetz is on hand, too, showing how he practises in his elaborate California studio, and Dimitri Mitropoulos, behaving like a cat in a bed of catnip, exhorts the New York Philharmonic-Symphony in meaningless excerpts from Liszt's "A Faust Symphony."

C.S.

PRINTED BY NATIONAL PUBLISHING CO., 301 N ST., N.E., WASHINGTON 2, D. C.

UNITY HOUSE

Forest Park, Pa.

RESERVATIONS NOW

OPENING FRIDAY, JUNE 8th

Write . . . Phone
1710 Broadway, New York 19
Phone: COlumbus 5-7000

Unity House is owned and operated by the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union on a non profit basis.

BOOKS

ATHEIST BOOKS, 32-page catalogue free. Truth Seeker Co., 38 Park Row, N. Y. C. 8.

HANDWRITING ANALYSIS

SCIENTIFIC HANDWRITING analysis, Alfred Kanfer, 62 Leroy St., N. Y. C. Tel. WA. 4-1575. Cooperating with doctors, psychologists, schools, firms, industries. Lessons. By appointment, or mail. Marital, educational, vocational, psychological problems. Fee $5.00.

LANGUAGES

LANGUAPHONE MAKES LANGUAGES EASY. At home learn to speak Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, French, German, Russian, by quick, easy Linguaphone Conversational method. Save time, work, money. Send for FREE book. Linguaphone Institute, 8603, Rockefeller Plaza, New York.

ALL LANGUAGES BY RECORDS. ALL MAKES. Sold, bought; rented inexpensively. Alin, 475 Fifth Avenue, New York, Mu 3-1093.

LITERARY SERVICES

WRITERS—Efficient sales service for your books, short stories, articles, plays. Free booklet. Write today! Daniel S. Mead Literary Agency, 419 4th Ave., New York 16, N. Y.

MAPLE SYRUP

NEW SEASON pure Maple Syrup, Vermont certified fancy grade. Gallon, $5.75; half gallon, $3.00; quart, $1.80. Pound maple sugar bricks $1.00. You pay postage. Marshall Smith, Jamaica, Vermont.

PUBLIC RELATIONS COUNSEL

Public Relations in the Nation's Capital; a full range of services including counsel, surveys and research, promotion and publicity. Charles Alldredge, Kellogg Bldg., Washington 4, D. C.

PUBLISHING

WE PRINT, publish and distribute your manuscript in pamphlet or book form. Send for free folder WILLIAM-FREDERICK PRESS; Pamphlet Distributing Company, 313 West 35 St., N.Y.

TYPING

MANUSCRIPT typing, theses, medical articles, specifications. Speed, intelligence, economy. Ambassador Office Service, 17 East 48th Street, New York. Plaza 5-1127.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE JOB AHEAD

Time-tested Red Cross services, backed by the generosity of the American people, have helped the victims of disaster . . . brought comfort to servicemen in camps and hospitals and to their families . . . assisted veterans . . . protected the health of the nation.

Again, the Red Cross mobilizes for mercy!
With your help, the nation's call for Red Cross assistance on a scale unprecedented in peacetime will be answered promptly and effectively. Here are some of the enormous tasks that have been accepted by your Red Cross:

Providing for instant use, tremendous amounts of blood plasma;
Training some 20-million persons in first aid;
Instructing 100,000 women and girls to serve as nurse's aides;
Recalling and retraining 150,000 former nurse's aides;
Teaching many more thousands home nursing skills;
Recruiting more than half a million additional volunteers to aid local defense units and to serve in expanding military installations.

MARCH IS RED CROSS MONTH

Only Your Support Can Make These Vital Activities Possible

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED